

nsc.

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1058 OF 2016**

Ramesh Hanmantrao More	...Applicant
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra and Ors.	...Respondents

**WITH
ANTICIPATORY BAIL APPLICATION NO.1059 OF 2016**

Rajendra Sopanrao Ghule	...Applicant
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra and Ors.	...Respondents

Mr.Niranjan Mundargi, i/b Mr.A.Mantri, for the Applicant in ABA No.1058 of 2016.

Mr.Vaibhav Bagade i/b Mr.A.Mantri, for the Applicant in ABA No.1059 of 2016.

Ms.S.S.Kaushik, A.P.P for the Respondent-State

Mr.H.S.Venegaokar, for the Respondent No.2 – CBI.

***CORAM : REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.
DATE : 5th JULY, 2016***

P.C. :

1. Heard learned Counsel for the applicants, learned counsel for respondent no.2 and the learned A.P.P.

2. By these applications, the applicants seek Transit Bail.
3. The applicants are apprehending arrest in connection with case no.RC 04 (S)/2010-SCU.V/SC-II/CBI, New Delhi under Section 120B, 342, 344, 348, 365, 193, 218 of the Indian Penal Code.
4. At the outset, learned counsel for the applicants do not press prayer clause (a). As far as prayer clause (b) is concerned, both the learned counsel for the applicants state that the applicants be protected for a period of six weeks, so as to enable them to approach the appropriate Court, for filing an appropriate application seeking appropriate reliefs in the aforesaid case.
5. Learned Counsel for the Applicants submitted that the CBI had filed a closure report as against the applicants in the said case in Indore. They submitted that the learned Special Judicial Magistrate, CBI Court, Indore, Madhya Pradesh, did not accept the said closure report and was pleased to issue NBW as against the applicants vide order dated 30th May, 2016 for the offences punishable under Sections 120B, 342, 344, 348,

365, 193, 218 of the Indian Penal Code.

6. Learned Counsel for the respondent no.2 – CBI does not dispute the fact, that a closure report was filed by the CBI in the Indore Court, however, he opposes the grant of any relief to the applicants.

7. Without going into the merits, the applicants are granted protection for a period of three weeks i.e. the applicants shall not be arrested for a period of three weeks from today to enable them to approach the appropriate Court for seeking appropriate reliefs, in the aforesaid case.

8. It is made clear, that this Court has not considered the applications on merits.

9. The Applications are accordingly disposed of.

10. All concerned to act on the authenticated copy of this order.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.